



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Planning Grant, Round 2, FY 2011-2012

Applicant	Plumas County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	County	Plumas, Butte, Sierra, Lassen & Shasta
Project Title	Upper Feather River IRWM Plan Update	Grant Request	\$798,704
		Total Project Cost	\$1,114,339

Project Description The Upper Feather River Regional Water Management Group is seeking planning grant funding for the update of its current IRWM Plan under the Proposition 84 Grant Program. The Plan will be updated to meet Proposition 84 standards, increase the Region's outreach to and management of DAC water systems, and incorporate climate change adaptation strategies.

Evaluation Summary

Scoring Criterion	Score
Work Plan	9
DAC Involvement	10
Schedule	4
Budget	6
Program Preferences	5
Tie Breaker	0
Total Score	34

- **Work Plan** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The Work Plan contains the appropriate sections; however, it does not contain adequate information. For example, the studies cited in Section III are not discussed in any specific tasks within the Work Plan or in the Schedule, and only lump sum project costs are given in the Budget. The subtask deliverables are not clearly identified and some are missing (example: Subtask 1.3.3). Subtask 3.3 (As-Needed Support), seems to be a reserve of funds that is not a reimbursable cost according to the Guidelines for this grant program.
- **DAC Involvement** Criterion is fully addressed and is supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. The Applicant devotes specific tasks to support sustained outreach targets, engagement activities, governance updates, and project development activities. This includes a new governance structure that will provide the region with more stakeholder involvement related to: water resources, a public outreach component, and steering committee meetings that will work to support and accommodate DAC participation.
- **Schedule** Criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by sufficient rationale. The Schedule is consistent with the Work Plan and Budget however Task 3's proposed timeline is not reasonable. For example, the PSP states that "the schedule should show... an end date approximately two years from the effective date." Task 3 has an end date that extends over a span from 10/10/12 to 11/20/2017.
- **Budget** Criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete and insufficient. Although the Budget's tasks are consistent with the Work Plan and Schedule, the Applicant did not demonstrate that the costs are reasonable. For example, Tables 3a-3c do not provide a basis for the estimated travel time. Table 3a includes two pre-grant RWMG meetings that are not cited in the Work Plan or Schedule, and Table 3b notes that there are 6 steering committee meetings in 2013 and 5 in 2014, where the Schedule states 7 in 2013 and 4 in 2014. Also, Meeting #8 appears twice in Table 3-b.



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Planning Grant, Round 2, FY 2011-2012

The Budget does not document the \$20,000 in-kind funding match for Subtask 2-3. The Work Plan only describes a \$2,000 cost “for consultation, data collection, GIS map preparation, etc.”

- **Program Preference** The Proposal sufficiently documents that 12 of the 15 program preferences will be met.
- **Tie Breaker** Not Applicable.